



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_25618
Title of the Manuscript:	Functionally Graded Coating Material of Cementless Knee Prosthesis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Some corrections are recommended: Page 1 – The acronym HA has not been identified at the point of its first use in the Introduction (the abstract uses HAP without any explanation either). Page 2 – peri-apatite is referred to as periapatite Page 2 – The sentence starting with 'For such a design,....', states HA- coating, which is confusing with the-HA coating referred to earlier in the page. Replace et. al. with <i>et al.</i> Page 3, first line - FGM should be stated as the acronym here at the point of first use. Methodology section – replace 8mm with 8 mm and similarly for other instances. Hydroxyapatite is identified as HAP here rather than earlier in the text. Replace Figure. with Figure throughout the manuscript. Page 4 – use subscripts for volume fraction terms, i.e., V_1 and V_2. References should be provided for equations 1 – 3. Following equation 6, state that the Poisson's ratios are for	HAP was identified at the point of its first use peri-apatite was changed to periapatite All HA was changed to HAP et. al. was replaced by <i>et al.</i> <i>FGM was written in this place.</i> <i>All 40mm was replaced by 40 mm</i> All Figure. Were Replaced with Figure V_1 and V_2 was replaced by V_1 and V_2. Ref. Were added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the two components of the FGM rather than as described. Reference 18 is missing in the text of the manuscript. Page 5, third line of variable 1 – replace it is with its and also on the following page. Results and Discussion – the authors state that “The optimal materials were found to hydroxyapatite and collagen.” Either this sentence should be referenced or the authors should state why they chose these materials for their study. A sentence or two regarding why von Mises stress is relevant for this study would help. The Results and Discussion section should be split into at least two paragraphs. Page 7, line 10 from the bottom – replace the sentence with “Furthermore, a rigidly bonded interface was assumed” and in the next line, replace through with by and researches with researchers. Delete also in the third from last line. Page 8 – I presume the authors meant to title the section as Conclusions rather than Discussion. On line 3 of this section, the sentence should perhaps read “This optimal design leads to positive success of implantation and”. Replace like in third line from last with as the.	the Poisson’s ratios was defined Reference 18 not missing. See [3,16-20] I was added reasons and Ref. I was added the reasons. It was done It was done It was done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	